

UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

ENHANCEMENT OF PHOSPHORUS SOLUBILIZATION FROM PHOSPHATE ROCKS AND PLANT NUTRIENT AVAILABILITY THROUGH VERMICOMPOSTING

TENGKU SABRINA DJUNITA

T FP 2007 10



ENHANCEMENT OF PHOSPHORUS SOLUBILIZATION FROM PHOSPHATE ROCKS AND PLANT NUTRIENT AVAILABILITY THROUGH VERMICOMPOSTING

By

TENGKU SABRINA DJUNITA

Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, in Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

April 2007



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

ENHANCEMENT OF PHOSPHORUS SOLUBILIZATION FROM PHOSPHATE ROCKS AND PLANT NUTRIENT AVAILABILITY THROUGH VERMICOMPOSTING

By

TENGKU SABRINA DJUNITA

April 2007

Chairman : Professor Mohamed Hanafi Musa, PhD, AMIC

Faculty : Agriculture

Large amount of organic materials (OM), from oil palm by-products produced by plantations in Malaysia creates potential pollutants and habitat for certain parasitic insects and pathogen. Incorporation of these materials with phosphate rock (PR) and earthworm through vermicomposting process would promote the dissolution and plant availability of phosphorus (P) from PR. This study investigated the effect of oil palm by-products and earthworms in dissolution different types of PRs for production of vermiphosphocompost (VPC) in fulfilling the P requirement of *Setaria splendida* in comparison to the using of arbuscular mycorrhiza (AM) in a glasshouse. The potential of earthworm in using oil palm by-products was investigated by surveying the population and diversity of earthworms in oil palm plantation with different types of soils and palm tree ages. Only exotic endogeic *Pontoscolex corethrurus* was found in oil palm plantation with low population (0 - 42 individual m⁻²). Heterogeneity of earthworm population in oil palm plantation attributed to food and soil physical habitat as determined by a principal component analysis (PCA). Vermicomposting of PR mixed EFB using *Eisenia fetida* in the laboratory



gave a higher dissolution of P with morocco PR (MPR) >gafsa PR (GPR) > togo PR (TPR) than that of normal compost system. The corresponding values for frond were 165, 52, and 30%. This was attributed to higher humic acid content in VPC (0.07 g), the population of bacteria, extractable Ca, and enzymes phosphomonoesterase in the The bacteria in EFB-earthworm intestine was identified as gut of earthworm. Pseudomonas nitroreducens, and P. citronellolis, and Cellulomonas flavigena in frond-reared earthworm. Fresh EFB contain a significant value of total extractable phenol (10 g GAE 100 g^{-1} extract) at the beginning of composting process and decreased gradually after 4 weeks decomposition. The compound identified in fresh EFB was 2,4-bis(1,1-dimethyl)phenol, composted and field composted EFB was 2,6bis(1,1-dimethyl) phenol. In contrast, there was no phenol detected in vermicomposted EFB. The direct application of 3 types earthworms in the glasshouse study using Setaria grass did not gave a significant difference on P availability, total nutrients in soil, nutrient-uptake and dry matter (DM) yield of The VPC showed better growth of Setaria grass compared to EFB and grass. conventional compost. *Setaria* needed about 75 ton ha⁻¹ VPC to achieve a maximum DM for this experiment Inorganic fertilizer (GPR) mixed with EFB, AM and worm enhanced Setaria grass yield (60%) compare to GPR only and by using VPC (79%). The contribution of AM, earthworm of GPR on P uptake was varied depend on the interaction among them. In conclusion, VPC is the best way to managing EFB. Its nutrients content can support Setaria growth. Improvement of Setaria grass growth and plant availability of P and other nutrients (N and K) as indicated by nutrients uptake was obtained by mixing EFB with worm, AM, and inorganic fertilizers.



PENINGKATAN PELARUTAN FOSFORUS DARI BATUAN FOSFAT DAN KETERSEDIAAN NUTRIEN BAGI TANAMAN MELALUI VERMIKOMPOS

Oleh

TENGKU SABRINA DJUNITA

April 2007

Pengerusi : Profesor Mohamed Hanafi Musa, PhD, AMIC

Fakulti : Pertanian

Jumlah bahan organik (OM) yang banyak dari produk sampingan kelapa sawit yang dikeluarkan oleh ladang di Malaysia berpotensi menjadi bahan cemar dan habitat bagi serangga parasitik dan patogen tertentu. Pencampuran bahan-bahan tersebut dengan batuan fosfat (PR) dan cacing tanah melalui proses vermikompos akan meningkatkan pelarutan dan fosforus tersedia (P) bagi tanaman dari PR. Kajian ini meneneliti pengaruh hasil sampingan kelapa sawit dan cacing tanah untuk melarutkan berbagai jenis PRs untuk menghasilkan vermiphosphokompos (VPC) bagi memenuhi keperluan P untuk Setaria splendida dibandingkan dengan penggunaan arbuskular mikoriza (AM) di rumah kaca. Potensi menggunakan cacing tanah pada hasil sampingan kelapa sawit diuji dengan tinjauan populasi dan kepelbagaian cacing tanah di ladang kelapa sawit pada berberapa jenis tanah dan umur pokok kelapa sawit yang berbeza. Hanya cacing endogeic eksotik *Pontoscolex corethrurus* ditemui di ladang kelapa sawit dengan populasi yang rendah (0 - 42)individu m^{-2}). Kepelbagaian populasi cacing tanah di ladang kelapa sawit bergantung pada makanan dan sifat fizik habitat seperti yang ditentukan dengan



prinsip komponen analisis (PCA). Vermikompos dari PR dicampur dengan tandan kelapa sawit kosong (EFB) menggunakan Eisenia fetida di makmal memberikan pelarutan P yang tinggi dengan morocco PR (MPR) > gafsa PR (GPR) > togo PR (TPR) dari sistem kompos biasa. Nilai yang sama bagi pelepah kelapa sawit adalah 165, 52 dan 30%. Ini disebabkan oleh kandungan asid humik yang tinggi pada VPC (0.07g), populasi bakteria, Ca vang boleh diekstrak, dan enzim phosphomonoesterase pada kotoran cacing tanah. Bakteria dalam sistem pencernaan cacing-EFB adalah Pseudomonas nitroreducens dan P. citronellolis, dan Cellulomonas flavigena dalam cacing menggunakan pelepah kelapa sawit. Jumlah phenol yang dapat diekstrak sebanyak (10 g GAE 100 g⁻¹ ekstrak) terdapat di awal proses pengkomposan EFB dan menurun setelah 4 minggu proses penguraian. Jenis sebatian yang terdapat dalam EFB segar adalah 2,4-bis(1,1-dimethyl)phenol, manakala yang telah di kompos adalah 2,6-bis (1,1-dimethyl)phenol. Sebaliknya tiada phenol didapati di dalam vermikompos EFB. Penggunaan terus 3 jenis cacing tanah di kajian rumah kaca menggunakan rumput Setaria tidak menunjukkan perbezaan yang bererti terhadap P tersedia, jumlah nutrient dalam tanah, pengambilan nutrient, dan hasil berat kering (DM) rumput. Penggunaan VPC menunjukkan pertumbuhan yang lebih baik bagi rumput Setaria berbanding EFB dan kompos konvensional. Setaria memerlukan sebanyak 75 tan ha⁻¹ VPC untuk mencapai hasil berat kering Penggunaan GPR dicampur dengan EFB, AM, dan cacing tanah maksimum. meningkatkan berat kering rumput Setaria sebanyak 60% berbanding dengan GPR sahaja dan dengan menggunakan VPC (79%). Sumbangan AM, cacing tanah GPR terhadap pengambilan berbeza dan bergantung pada interaksi antaranya. Sebagai kesimpulannya, VPC adalah cara yang terbaik untuk menguruskan EFB. Kandungan nutriennya boleh menyokong pertumbuhan Setaria. Peningkatkan pertumbuhan



rumput *Setaria* dan ketersediaan P dan nutrien lain (N dan K) ditunjukkan dengan kemampuan pengambilan nutrien yang diperolehi dengan mencampurkan EFB dengan cacing tanah, AM dan baja inorganik.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation to the following people for their contributions towards the completion of this thesis:

Prof. Dr. Mohamed Hanafi Musa, for his supervision, continual guidance, enthusiasm, encouragement, patience, and friendship during the course of my study.

Assoc.Prof. Dr.Mahmud Tengku Muda, for valuable discussion and constructive criticism.

Dr. Nor Azwady Abd Aziz, for his supervision, valuable suggestions, patience and friendship.

All staff in the Department of Land Management, for their assistance and friendship throughout the course of my study.

All Indonesian friends at UPM, for their friendship.

Finally, but most important, my family, for their prayers, love and continual support.



I certify that an Examination Committee has met on the April 4, 2007 to conduct the final examination of Tengku Sabrina Djunita on her Doctor of Philosophy thesis entitled "Enhancement of P Solubilization and Plant Nutrient Availability from Phosphate Rocks Through Vermicomposting and Arbuscular Mycorrhiza" in accordance with Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree)Act 1980 and Universiti Pertanian (Higher Degree) Regulations 1981. The Committee recommends that the candidate be awarded the relevant degree. Members of the Examination Committee are as follows:

Syamsudin J., PhD

Professor Faculty of Graduate Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia (Chairman)

Radziah Othman, PhD

Associate Professor Faculty of Graduate Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia (Internal Examiner)

Halimi Abd. Saud, PhD

Faculty of Graduate Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia (Internal Examiner)

Iswandi Anas, PhD

Professor Faculty of Graduate Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia (External Examiner)

> HASANAH MOHD. GHAZALI, PhD Professor/Deputy Dean School of Graduate Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

2007



This thesis submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee are as follows:

Mohamed Hanafi Musa, PhD, AMIC

Professor Faculty of Agriculture Universiti Putra Malaysia (Chairman)

Mahmud Tengku Muda Mohamed, PhD

Associate Professor Faculty of Agriculture Universiti Putra Malaysia (Member)

Nor Azwady Abd. Aziz, PhD

Lecturer Faculty of Science Universiti Putra Malaysia (Member)

AINI IDERIS, PhD

Professor/Dean School of Graduate Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 14 June 2007



DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the thesis is based on my original work except for the quotations and the citations which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously or concurrently submitted for any other degree at UPM or other institutions.

TENGKU SABRINA DJUNITA

Date: 3 May 2007



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ABSTRAK	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
APPROVAL SHEETS	viii
DECLARATION	Х
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF FIGURES	xviii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxi

CHAPTER

1	INT	RODUCTION	1.1
2	LIT	ERATURE REVIEW	2.1
	2.1	Phosphate in Soil	2.1
	2.2	Function of Phosphate in Agriculture	2.4
	2.3	Dissolution of Phosphate Rock	2.7
		2.3.1 Factors Affecting Phosphate Rock Dissolution	2.8
		2.3.2 Availability of Dissolved P	2.16
	2.4	Arbuscular Mycorrhiza	2.16
		2.4.1 Carbon Metabolism and Movement	2.17
		2.4.2 Benefit of AM Symbiosis to Plants	2.19
		2.4.3 Factors Affecting AM Infection	2.20
	2.5	Earthworm	2.20
		2.5.1 The Morphology of Earthworm	2.20
		2.5.2 The Biology of Earthworm	2.24
		2.5.3 Factors Affecting Earthworm Distribution and	2.26
		2.5.4 Beneficial Effect of Earthworm on Soil Ecosystem	2.34
	26	Vermicompost	2 35
	$\frac{1}{2}$	Oil palm by-products	2 37
	2.8	Summary	2.39
3	GEI	NERAL MATERIALS AND METHODS	3.1
	3.1	Preparation of Materials	3.1
	3.2	Soil Analysis	3.4
	3.3	Compost Analysis	3.5
	3.4	Plant Analysis	3.5
4	TH	E INFLUENCE OF SOIL TYPE AND OIL PALM AGE ON	4.1
	EAI	RTHWORM POPULATIONS AND CAST PROPERTIES	
	4.1	Introduction	4.1
	4.2	Materials and Methods	4.3
		4.2.1 Survey Location	4.3
		4.2.2 Sampling Technique	4.4



	4.2	4.2.3 Statistical Analysis	4.5
	4.3	Result and Discussion	4.5
		4.3.1 Distribution and Population of Earthworm	4.5
		4.3.2 Soil Factors Affecting the Distribution of Earthworm Population	4.9
		4.3.3 Relationship between Soil Properties and Earthworm Cast	4.13
	4.4	Conclusion	4.19
5	VEI PR(RMIPHOSPHOCOMPOSTING USING OIL PALM BY- DDUCTS AND PHOSPHATE ROCKS	5.1
	5.1	Introduction	5.1
	5.2	Materials and Methods	5.3
		5.2.1 Screening The Earthworms for Vermicomposting	5.3
		5.2.2 Stocking Density on Vermicomposting of EFB	5.4
		5.2.3 Effect of Pre-Composted Time and Size of EFB on Earthworm Growth, Mortality and Vermicompost Quality	5.4
		5.2.4 Dissolution of Phosphate Rocks in Vermicompost System	5.5
	5.3	Result and Discussion	5.9
		5.3.1 Screening Earthworm for Vermicomposting	5.9
		5.3.2 Earthworm Stocking Density on Vermicompost of EFB	5.10
		5.3.3 Effect of Pre-Composted Time and Size of Particle on Vermicomposting of EFB	5.16
		5.3.4 Dissolution of Phosphate Rocks and Chemical and Microbiological Content of Vermicompost	5.24
	5.4	Conclusions	5.43
6	EFH EAI FIF	ECT OF EMPTY FRUIT BUNCH APPLICATION ON THWORM POPULATION AND PHENOL CONTENT IN LD CONDITION	6.1
	61	Introduction	61
	6.2	Materials and Methods	63
	0.2	6.2.1 Total Extractable Polyphenolic Content of Decomposed EFB	6.3
		6.2.2 The Type of Phenol in Decomposed EFB	63
		6.2.3 Effect of EFB on Earthworm Population under Field Condition	6.5
	6.3	Result and Discussion	67
	0.0	6.3.1 Total Extractable Phenol in Composted EFB	67
		6.3.2 The Type of Phenolic Compounds in Raw and Decomposed EFB	6.9
		633 Effect of EFB on Earthworm Population	613
	64	Conclusion	6 15
			0.10



Spirman7.1Introduction7.17.2Materials and Method7.37.2.1Effect of Rates and Types of EFB Preparation on Growth and Nutrients Uptake by grass7.37.2.2Interaction of Earthworm, Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P Uptake by Setaria Grass7.57.2.3Comparison Between Mixed Organic - Inorganic Fertilizers7.87.2.4Effect of Earthworm Type on Growth and P uptake by Grass7.107.3.1Effect of Rate and Type of EFB Preparation on Growth and Nutrients Uptake by Grass7.127.3.2Interaction of Earthworm, Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P uptake by Grass7.267.3.2Interaction of Earthworm, Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P uptake by Grass7.267.3.3Comparison Between Mixed Organic -Inorganic Fertilizers7.417.3.4Effect of Earthworm Types on Growth and P uptake by Grass7.428GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION8.18REFERENCES APPENDICESR.18B1	7	EFF ARI ANI	ECT BUSCU D PHO ndida)	OF ORGANIC MATTER, EARTHWORM AND ILAR MYCORRHIZA IN ENHANCING GROWTH, SPHORUS UPTAKE BY SETARIA GRASS (Setaria	7.1
7.1 Initialization 7.1 7.2 Materials and Method 7.3 7.2.1 Effect of Rates and Types of EFB Preparation on Growth and Nutrients Uptake by grass 7.3 7.2.2 Interaction of Earthworm, Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P Uptake by Setaria Grass 7.5 7.2.3 Comparison Between Mixed Organic - Inorganic Fertilizers 7.2 7.3.4 Effect of Earthworm Type on Growth and P uptake by Grass 7.10 7.3.1 Effect of Rate and Type of EFB Preparation on Growth and Nutrients Uptake by Grass 7.12 7.3.1 Effect of Rate and Type of EFB Preparation on Growth and Nutrients Uptake by Grass 7.26 7.3.2 Interaction of Earthworm, Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P uptake by Grass 7.26 7.3.3 Comparison Between Mixed Organic -Inorganic Fertilizers 7.31 7.3.4 Effect of Earthworm Types on Growth and P uptake by Grass 7.41 7.4 Conclusion 7.52 8 GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION 8.1 REFERENCES R.1 APPENDICES A.1 BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR B.1		7 1	Introdu	uction	71
7.2 Materials and Included 7.3 7.2.1 Effect of Rates and Types of EFB Preparation on Growth and Nutrients Uptake by grass 7.3 7.2.2 Interaction of Earthworm, Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P Uptake by Setaria Grass 7.5 7.2.3 Comparison Between Mixed Organic - Inorganic Fertilizers 7.2 7.2.4 Effect of Earthworm Type on Growth and P uptake by Grass 7.10 7.3.1 Effect of Rate and Type of EFB Preparation on Growth and Nutrients Uptake by Grass 7.12 7.3.1 Effect of Rate and Type of EFB Preparation on Growth and Nutrients Uptake by Grass 7.26 7.3.2 Interaction of Earthworm, Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P uptake by Grass 7.26 7.3.3 Comparison Between Mixed Organic -Inorganic Fertilizers 7.31 7.3.4 Effect of Earthworm Types on Growth and P uptake by Grass 7.32 7.3.3 Comparison Between Mixed Organic -Inorganic Fertilizers 7.34 7.3.4 Effect of Earthworm Types on Growth and P uptake by Grass 7.52 8 GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION 8.1 REFERENCES R.1 APPENDICES R.1 BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR <t< td=""><td></td><td>7.1</td><td>Materi</td><td>ials and Method</td><td>7.1</td></t<>		7.1	Materi	ials and Method	7.1
7.2.1 Effect of Rates and Types of EFB Preparation on Growth and Nutrients Uptake by grass 7.3 7.2.2 Interaction of Earthworm, Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P Uptake by Setaria Grass 7.5 7.2.3 Comparison Between Mixed Organic - Inorganic Fertilizers 7.8 7.2.4 Effect of Earthworm Type on Growth and P uptake by Grass 7.10 7.3 Results and Discussion 7.12 7.3.1 Effect of Rate and Type of EFB Preparation on Growth and Nutrients Uptake by Grass 7.26 7.3.2 Interaction of Earthworm, Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P uptake by Grass 7.26 7.3.3 Comparison Between Mixed Organic -Inorganic Fertilizers 7.31 7.3.4 Effect of Earthworm Types on Growth and P uptake by Grass 7.41 7.4 Conclusion 7.52 8 GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION 8.1 REFERENCES R.1 APPENDICES A.1 BIODATA OF THE AUTHOP B.1		1.2	7 2 1	Effect of Rates and Types of FER Prenaration on	7.5
7.2.2 Interaction of Earthworm, Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P Uptake by Setaria Grass 7.5 7.2.3 Comparison Between Mixed Organic - Inorganic Fertilizers 7.8 7.2.4 Effect of Earthworm Type on Growth and P uptake by Grass 7.10 7.3 Results and Discussion 7.12 7.3.1 Effect of Rate and Type of EFB Preparation on Growth and Nutrients Uptake by Grass 7.26 7.3.2 Interaction of Earthworm, Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P uptake by Grass 7.26 7.3.3 Comparison Between Mixed Organic -Inorganic Fertilizers 7.41 7.3.4 Effect of Earthworm Types on Growth and P uptake by Grass 7.42 7.4 Conclusion 7.52 8 GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION 8.1 REFERENCES R.1 APPENDICES A.1 BIODATA OF THE AUTHOP B.1			1.2.1	Growth and Nutrients Uptake by grass	1.5
Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P Uptake by Setaria Grass7.2.3Comparison Between Mixed Organic - Inorganic Fertilizers7.87.2.4Effect of Earthworm Type on Growth and P uptake by Grass7.107.3Results and Discussion7.127.3.1Effect of Rate and Type of EFB Preparation on Growth and Nutrients Uptake by Grass7.127.3.2Interaction of Earthworm, Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P uptake by Grass7.267.3.3Comparison Between Mixed Organic -Inorganic Fertilizers7.417.3.4Effect of Earthworm Types on Growth and P uptake by Grass7.497.4Conclusion7.528GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION8.1REFERENCES APPENDICESR.1 APPENDICESR.1 A.1			7.2.2	Interaction of Earthworm, Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and	7.5
Uptake by Setaria Grass 7.2.3 Comparison Between Mixed Organic - Inorganic Fertilizers 7.8 7.2.4 Effect of Earthworm Type on Growth and P uptake by Grass 7.10 7.3 Results and Discussion 7.12 7.3.1 Effect of Rate and Type of EFB Preparation on Growth and Nutrients Uptake by Grass 7.12 7.3.2 Interaction of Earthworm, Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P uptake by Grass 7.33 7.3.3 Comparison Between Mixed Organic -Inorganic Fertilizers 7.41 7.3.4 Effect of Earthworm Types on Growth and P uptake by Grass 7.42 7.4 Conclusion 7.52 8 GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION 8.1 REFERENCES R.1 APPENDICES A.1				Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P	
7.2.3 Comparison Between Mixed Organic - Inorganic Fertilizers 7.8 7.2.4 Effect of Earthworm Type on Growth and P uptake by Grass 7.10 7.3 Results and Discussion 7.12 7.3.1 Effect of Rate and Type of EFB Preparation on Growth and Nutrients Uptake by Grass 7.12 7.3.2 Interaction of Earthworm, Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P uptake by Grass 7.3 7.3.3 Comparison Between Mixed Organic -Inorganic Fertilizers 7.41 7.3.4 Effect of Earthworm Types on Growth and P uptake by Grass 7.42 8 GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION 8.1 REFERENCES APPENDICES R.1 APPENDICES B I A.1				Uptake by Setaria Grass	
Fertilizers 7.2.4 Effect of Earthworm Type on Growth and P uptake by Grass 7.10 7.3 Results and Discussion 7.12 7.3.1 Effect of Rate and Type of EFB Preparation on Growth and Nutrients Uptake by Grass 7.12 7.3.2 Interaction of Earthworm, Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P uptake by Grass 7.3.3 7.3.3 Comparison Between Mixed Organic -Inorganic Fertilizers 7.41 7.3.4 Effect of Earthworm Types on Growth and P uptake by Grass 7.52 8 GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION 8.1 REFERENCES A.1 BIDOA TA OF THE AUTHOR			7.2.3	Comparison Between Mixed Organic - Inorganic	7.8
7.2.4 Effect of Earthworm Type on Growth and P uptake by Grass 7.10 7.3 Results and Discussion 7.12 7.3.1 Effect of Rate and Type of EFB Preparation on Growth and Nutrients Uptake by Grass 7.12 7.3.2 Interaction of Earthworm, Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P uptake by Grass 7.26 7.3.3 Comparison Between Mixed Organic -Inorganic Fertilizers 7.41 7.3.4 Effect of Earthworm Types on Growth and P uptake by Grass 7.42 8 GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION 8.1 REFERENCES APPENDICES R.1 APPENDICES A.1			,	Fertilizers	
7.3 Results and Discussion 7.12 7.3.1 Effect of Rate and Type of EFB Preparation on Growth and Nutrients Uptake by Grass 7.12 7.3.2 Interaction of Earthworm, Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P uptake by Grass 7.26 7.3.3 Comparison Between Mixed Organic -Inorganic Fertilizers 7.41 7.3.4 Effect of Earthworm Types on Growth and P uptake by Grass 7.52 8 GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION 8.1 REFERENCES R.1 APPENDICES A.1 BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR B.1			724	Effect of Earthworm Type on Growth and P uptake by	7 10
7.3 Results and Discussion 7.12 7.3.1 Effect of Rate and Type of EFB Preparation on Growth and Nutrients Uptake by Grass 7.12 7.3.2 Interaction of Earthworm, Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P uptake by Grass 7.26 7.3.3 Comparison Between Mixed Organic -Inorganic Fertilizers 7.41 7.3.4 Effect of Earthworm Types on Growth and P uptake by Grass 7.52 8 GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION 8.1 REFERENCES R.1 APPENDICES R.1 BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR B.1			,	Grass	,
7.3.1Effect of Rate and Type of EFB Preparation on Growth and Nutrients Uptake by Grass7.127.3.2Interaction of Earthworm, Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P uptake by Grass7.267.3.3Comparison Between Mixed Organic -Inorganic Fertilizers7.417.3.4Effect of Earthworm Types on Growth and P uptake by Grass7.498GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION8.1REFERENCES BIODATA OF THE AUTHORR.1		73	Result	s and Discussion	7 12
And the and Type of Did Treparation of the Growth and Nutrients Uptake by Grass 7.12 Growth and Nutrients Uptake by Grass 7.26 Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P uptake by Grass 7.26 7.3.3 Comparison Between Mixed Organic -Inorganic Fertilizers 7.41 Fertilizers 7.3.4 Effect of Earthworm Types on Growth and P uptake by Grass 7.49 by Grass 7.4 Conclusion 7.52 8 GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION 8.1 REFERENCES R.1 APPENDICES A.1 BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR B.1		1.5	731	Effect of Rate and Type of EFB Preparation on	7.12
7.3.2Interaction of Earthworm, Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P uptake by Grass7.267.3.3Comparison Between Mixed Organic -Inorganic Fertilizers7.417.3.4Effect of Earthworm Types on Growth and P uptake by Grass7.497.4Conclusion7.528GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION8.1REFERENCES APPENDICES BIODATA OF THE AUTHORR.1			7.0.1	Growth and Nutrients Untake by Grass	/.1 _
Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P 1.20 uptake by Grass 7.3.3 Comparison Between Mixed Organic -Inorganic 7.41 Fertilizers 7.3.4 Effect of Earthworm Types on Growth and P uptake 7.49 by Grass 7.4 Conclusion 7.52 8 GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION 8.1 REFERENCES R.1 APPENDICES A.1 BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR B.1			732	Interaction of Earthworm Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and	7 26
uptake by Grass 7.3.3 Comparison Between Mixed Organic -Inorganic 7.41 Fertilizers 7.3.4 Effect of Earthworm Types on Growth and P uptake 7.49 by Grass 7.4 Conclusion 7.52 8 GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION 8.1 REFERENCES R.1 APPENDICES A.1 BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR B.1			1.3.2	Gafsa Phospate Rock on Plant Available P and P	7.20
7.3.3 Comparison Between Mixed Organic -Inorganic 7.41 Fertilizers 7.3.4 Effect of Earthworm Types on Growth and P uptake 7.49 by Grass 7.4 Conclusion 7.52 8 GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION 8.1 REFERENCES R.1 APPENDICES A.1 BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR B.1				uptake by Grass	
7.3.4Effect of Earthworm Types on Growth and P uptake by Grass7.497.4Conclusion7.528GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION8.1REFERENCES APPENDICES BIODATA OF THE AUTHORR.1			7.3.3	Comparison Between Mixed Organic -Inorganic Fertilizers	7.41
N.1.Entect of Each world Types on Growar and Taptakeby Grass7.4Conclusion8GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION8.1REFERENCESR.1APPENDICESBIODATA OF THE AUTHORB1			734	Effect of Earthworm Types on Growth and P untake	7 49
7.4 Conclusion7.528 GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION8.1REFERENCESR.1APPENDICESA.1BIODATA OF THE AUTHORB.1			7.5.1	hy Grass	7.12
8GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION8.1REFERENCESR.1APPENDICESA.1BIODATA OF THE AUTHORB.1		74	Conch	lision	7 52
8GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION8.1REFERENCESR.1APPENDICESA.1BIODATA OF THE AUTHORB.1		/. •	conen		1.52
REFERENCES R.1 APPENDICES A.1 BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR B1	8	GEI	NERAL	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	8.1
APPENDICES A.1 BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR B1	RF	FER	ENCES		R 1
RIODATA OF THE AUTHOR B1	ΔΡ	PEN	DICES	,	Δ 1
	RI		ΓA OF	THE AUTHOR	B 1



LIST OF TABLES

Table

Page

3.1	Chemical composition of oven dry EFB and Frond	3.1
3.2	Chemical characteristics of PRs	3.2
3.3	Chemical characteristics of VPC and compost	3.3
4.1	Physico-chemical characteristics and classification of the soils used in the study	4.3
4.2	Earthworm population and organic matter content under fronds heap and open soil surface	4.9
4.3	Eigenvalues and proportions of variance to the total variance for derived principal component	4.10
4.4	Factor pattern for the first four principal components	4.10
4.5	Dry weight of surface earthworm casts from oil palm plantation under different soil types and oil palm tree ages	4.13
4.6	Relationships between soil and earthworm cast properties and its relative percentage increase in value between cast and soil properties	4.14
4.7	Soil and earthworm cast particles components	4.15
5.1	Effect of earthworm stocking density on nutrients concentration of vermicompost	5.15
5.2	Relationship between earthworm stocking density rate and nutrients content in vermicompost	5.15
5.3	Mean of C/N, N, K, Mg and pH as influenced of size or pre- composted of EFB particle	5.22
5.4	The effect of earthworm, PRs and oil palm by-products on Δ P, Δ Ca, Δ P _b , pH, bacteria, humic acid, acid PME, alkaline PME, organic C, total N, P, K, Ca and Mg	5.29



5.5	The effect of dual interactions between oil palm by-products and PRs, PRs and worm, oil palm by-products and worm on Δ P, Δ Ca, Δ P _b , pH, bacteria, humic acid, acid PME, alkaline PME, organic C, total N, P, K, Ca and Mg	5.31
5.6	The effect of triple interactions between earthworm, PRs and oil palm by-products on ΔP , ΔCa , ΔP_b , pH, bacteria, humic acid, acid and alkaline phoshomonoesterase, organic C, total N, P, K, Ca and Mg	5.32
6.1	GC-MS conditions	6.4
6.2	The effect of application of EFB on earthworm population, C, N and total extractable phenol	6.14
7.1	Treatments of experiment comparison between mixed organic- inorganic fertilizers	7.9
7.2	Effect of rates and types of organic matter on DM of <i>Setaria</i> grass at 1 st harvest	7.14
7.3	Effect of rates and types of organic matter on root volume of <i>Setaria</i> grass	7.18
7.4	Effect of rates and types of organic matter on total N, P, K, Ca and Mg in soil	7.21
7.5	effect of AM, worm and PR on dry matter yield	7.27
7.6	Effect of AM, worm and PR on total N, P, K, Ca, and Mg in soil at the end of experiment	7.38
7.7	Effect of AM, worm and PR on changes in 0.5 M NaOH extractable (ΔP), P uptake (ΔP_s), and available P (ΔP_b) in the soil	7.41
7.8	Comparison between mixed organic-inorganic fertilizers on DM yield	7.42
7.9	Comparison between mixed organic-inorganic fertilizers on P uptake	7.43
7.10	Comparison between mixed organic-inorganic fertilizers on N uptake	7.44
7.11	Comparison between mixed organic-inorganic fertilizers on K uptake	7.44



- 7.13 Comparison between mixed organic-inorganic fertilizers on Mg 7.45 uptake
- 7.14 Nutrients utilization efficiency of *Setaria* grass 7.46
- 7.15 Comparison between mixed organic-inorganic fertilizers on root 7.47 volume
- 7.16 Comparison between mixed organic-inorganic fertilizers on P 7.48 available in soil
- 7.17 Effect of mixed organic-inorganic fertilizers on changes in 0.5 M 7.49 NaOH extractable (ΔP), P uptake (ΔP_s), and available P (ΔP_b) in soil
- 7.18 Effect of different types of earthworm on cumulative N, P, K, Ca 7.50 and Mg uptake by grass *Setaria*
- 7.19 Effect of different types of earthworm on total N, P, K, Ca and Mg 7.51 uptake of soil



LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

2.1

2.2

2.3

Schematic diagram showing the rate-limiting factors (inside big box area) for phosphate rock dissolution in soils and the variables (boxes outside stippled area) which determine the magnitude and degree of interaction of the rate-limiting factors
Setae arrangements in section
Dorsal views of various forms of prostomium
Evenuelas of transcel contensions or consents

2.4	Examples of typical earthworm arrangements	2.23
4.1	Pontoscolex corethrurus from palm oil plantation in Malaysia	4.6
4.2	Prostomium form of P. corethrurus	4.6
4.3	The pearls shape of <i>P. corethrurus</i> cocoons collected from the palm oil plantation, Malaysia. White or pink cocoons indicate near hatching	4.7
4.4	Earthworm population in five soil types (Serdang, Rengam, Jerangau, Bungor, and Munchong) and three different oil palm ages ($<7, 7-14, >14$)	4.8
4.2	Principal component analysis 1 (horizontal) and 2 (vertical) of earthworm distribution pattern related to soil properties.	4.12
4.3	Principal component analysis 3 (horizontal) and 4 (vertical) of earthworm distribution pattern related to soil properties	4.12
5.1	Effects of earthworm stocking density ratio on vermicomposting of EFB on the weekly growth of earthworm	5.11
5.2	Effects of earthworm stocking density ratio on vermicomposting of EFB on percentage of earthworm survival	5.12
5.3	Cumulative mortality of earthworm of different earthworm stocking density	5.13

5.4 Effects of pre-composted and size on vermicomposting of EFB 5.17 on the weekly earthworm growth

Page

2.8

2.21

2.22

5.5	Effects of pre-composted and size on vermicomposting of EFB on the cumulative mortality of earthworm	5.18
5.6	Effect of EFB size particle (fine and coarse) and pre-composted on C content of vermicompost	5.19
5.7	Effect of size (fine and coarse) and pre-composted time on N, P, K, Ca and Mg content of vermicompost	5.21
5.8	Effect of EFB size particle (fine and coarse) and pre-composted on pH of vermicompost	5.23
5.9	Effects of incorporation of PR types into (i) vermicompost EFB and (ii) vermicompost frond on earthworm weight	5.25
5.10	Numbers of cocoon produced in EFB and frond added with PRs	5.26
5.11	Mortality of earthworm duringvermicomposting of EFB and frond with addition of PRs	5.27
5.12	pH of (i) EFB and (ii) frond during composting, and pH of (iii) EFB and (iv) frond during vermicomposting	5.36
5.13	Weight per volume of vermicomposting and compost of EFB and frond	5.39
6.1	Flow chart for the complete extraction and clean up process of identifying phenolic compounds from compost sample	6.5
6.2	Earthworm caging used in the field experiment	6.6
6.3	Total extractable phenol in decomposed EFB	6.8
6.4	Chromatogram of the phenolic compounds (BSTFA derivatives) of (i) fresh EFB, (ii) field composted EFB, (iii) composted EFB and (iv) vermicompost	6.10
6.5	Mass spectrum of (i) 2,4-bis(1,1-dimethylethyl)phenol of fresh EFB, (ii) 2,6-bis(1,1-dimethylethyl)phenol of field composted EFB, (iii) 2,6-bis(1,1-dimethylethyl)phenol of composted EFB and (iv) vermicompost EFB (BSTFA derivative)	6.11
6.6	Fragmentation of phenol	6.12
6.7	Structure of (i) 2,6-bis(1,1-dimethylethyl)phenol found in field composted and composted EFB, and (ii) 2,4-bis(1,1-dimethylethyl)phenol of fresh EFB	6.13
7.1	Pot containing AM, earthworm and EFB	7.6



7.2	The performance of dry weight of <i>S. splendida</i> with addition of (a) fresh EFB, (b) compost EFB and (c) vermicompost EFB for every harvest time	7.13
7.3	Effect of fresh, compost and VPC of EFB and dosage on grass DM	7.15
7.4	Roots of <i>S. splendida</i> treated with different organic matter types at a rate of 18.75 ton ha^{-1}	7.18
7.5	Effect of fresh, compost and VPC of EFB and dosage on N, P, K, Ca, and Mg uptake by grass <i>Setaria</i>	7.20
7.6	Effect of fresh, compost and VPC of EFB and dosage on plant available P	7.23
7.7	Effect of fresh, compost and VPC of EFB and dosage on residual P	7.24
7.8	Effect of fresh, compost and VPC of EFB and dosage on pH	7.25
7.9	Effect of fresh, compost and VPC of EFB and dosage on CEC	7.26
7.10	Interaction effect of i) AM and PR, ii) worm and PR, and iii) worm and PR on DM yield at the 4 th harvest	7.27
7.11	The contribution of AM on monthly nutrients uptake by <i>Setaria</i> grass for each worm and PR combination	7.29
7.12	The contribution of worm on monthly nutrients uptake by <i>Setaria</i> grass for each AM and PR combination	7.31
7.13	The contribution of AM and worm on cumulative nutrients uptake by <i>Setaria</i> grass	7.33
7.14	Phosphorus utilization efficiency by AM, worm and PR	7.36
7.15	Interaction effect of i) AM and PR, ii) AM and worm, and iii) worm and PR on AM colonization on <i>Setaria</i> root	7.37
7.16	Interaction effect of i)worm and AM, ii)worm and PR, and iii) AM and PR on total Ca in soil	7.39
7.17	Effect of interaction between AM, worm and PR on plant-available P	7.40
7.18	Effect of earthworm type on DM of grass Setaria	7.50



LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AA	Auto-analyzer
AAS	Atomic absorption spectrophotometer
AM	Arbuscular mycorrhiza
BSTFA	N.O-bis(trimethyl-silyl)triflouroecetamide
DCM	Dichloromethane
DM	Dry matter
EFB	Empty fruit bunch
ESDR	Earthworm stocking density ratio
GAE	Gallic acid equivalent
GC-MS	Gas chromatography mass spectrometer
GPR	Gafsa phosphate rock
MPR	Morocco phosphate rock
PCA	Principle component analysis
PR	Phosphate rock
TPR	Togo phosphate rock
TSP	Triple super phosphate
UPM	University Putra Malaysia
VPC	Vermiphosphocompost



CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Phosphorus (P) is one of the key nutrients limiting plant growth. Its availability to plants is controlled mainly by soil pH, soluble Al, Fe, Ca and organic matter content. Most of soils in Malaysia are acidic, predominantly of Ultisols and Oxisols. These soils showed greater capability to fix phosphate, through their Fe and Al contents. Hence, added P fertilizer is strongly immobilized. Therefore, regular fertilizer applications are required to maintain adequate supply of plant-available P. In this situation the use of phosphate rock (PR) as a direct-application fertilizer could be the most cost effective than a water-soluble P source. Moreover, the escalation in costs of manufacturing and distribution of soluble P fertilizers made PR the cheapest and important alternative source for P. The solubility of PR in the soil is affected by several factors, such as the type of PR, soil factors (chemical, physical and biological), and climatic condition. The types of PR and soil factors could be modified, for example by adding lime into the soil to increase soil pH. Modification of pH could shifted P form from non soluble into soluble form. Several alternatives have been used to increase P availability from PRs including: (i) incorporation of additives into PR, (ii) partial acidulation of PR, (iii) compaction of PR with watersoluble P fertilizers, and (iv) microbial methods.

Many other materials including organic materials could be used to modify soils, and subsequently increase solubility of P in soil. The organic materials and their decomposition products can reduce P fixation in soils. These are attributed to the reduction in P fixation due to the complexation of Al and Fe by organic acids,



competition between organic acids and orthophosphate for adsorption sites and release of P by organic material during decomposition.

As a major crop in Malaysia, oil palm produces by products in large quantities. Meanwhile, to maintain the production of fresh fruit bunch (FFB), oil palm trees need to be fertilized intensively using chemical fertilizers. By considering the large amount of these by-products they can be used to replace the nutrients lost by plant uptake. The total oil palm plantations area is around 4,051,374 ha in 2005 and expected to increase to 5.10 million ha in 2020 (Anonymous, 2005). For every tonne of crude palm oil (CPO) produced, three tonnes of palm oil mill effluent (POME) is generated. An average of 24 fronds is pruned every year, or equal to 11.7 tonnes ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ (Chan, 2000). About 18.88 tonnes ha⁻¹ y⁻¹ of FFB was produced in 2005 and has generated 11.3 tonnes EFB ha⁻¹ y⁻¹ (Anonymous, 2005).

Thus, oil palm by-products are potential sources of nutrients. However, oil palm byproducts are decomposed slowly in the environment. Soil micro and macroorganisms are required to enhance decomposition process. Soil macro-organisms, such as earthworm have a great potential to increase the soil productivity in oil palm plantation. Its role in P turnover is well known, about four to tenfold increase in P content and availability in earthworm casts result from enhanced mineralization of organic P (Sharpley and Syers, 1977). Inoculation of earthworms into the organic wastes during composting helps to enhance the transformation of organic P into mineral forms. In addition, they also keep the magnitude of fixation of released P into insoluble inorganic forms at low levels, thus increasing the availability of P in these compounds. Moreover, most of the additional P present in casts is held in more



physically sorbed than chemisorbed forms and a reduction in P sorption capacity of soil by organic matter blockage. At the same time, the presence of earthworm will enlarge the microorganism's population in the soil.

Plant roots are the most important organ for nutrients and water absorption and uptake by plants. In the case of abnormal roots growth, the nutrients uptake will impede. Association of arbuscular mycorrhiza (AM) with roots would give plant with vigorous growth of root systems, hence plant will able to absorb more nutrients especially for immobile nutrient like P. Besides that, mycorrhizal infected plants are expected to dissolve P from PR.

In view of the role of earthworms and the amount of agriculture by products produce in oil palm plantation and the lack information about earthworm under oil palm tree ecosystems, this research was carried out in several oil palm plantations in Malaysia, to determine the suitability of using earthworm in decomposition of oil palm byproducts, such EFB. The aims of this study were (i) to characterize earthworm populations and cast properties in different soil types and oil palm ages, and the relationships among soil properties on earthworm populations in the oil palm plantation, (ii) to evaluate the effect of vermicomposting on phosphate solubility of different P sources, (iii) to investigate the effect of application of EFB on earthworm population and activity under oil palm field condition, (iv) to evaluate the effect of vermiphosphocompost as a source of P fertilizer in fulfilling P requirement for plant growth compared to other sources, and (v) to evaluate the contribution of AM and earthworm in increasing P uptake by plant.



CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Phosphate in Soil

Phosphate is a critical element in natural and agricultural ecosystems throughout the world. The concentration of P in the soils is in the range of 100-3,000 mg P kg⁻¹ and the solubility is less than 0.01 mg PL⁻¹ (Brady and Weil, 2000) or around 0.1% of the total P. Most of soils have low P availability and in order to fulfill the plants P requirement, large quantities of P fertilizer and P-containing organic wastes have frequently been added.

The main sources of P in soil are from inorganic and organic phosphates. About 150 minerals are known to contain at least 0.44% P (1% P₂O₅). The world's supply of P comes from mineral deposits. The important inorganic phosphate source minerals is apatite group $Ca_{10}(PO_4, CO_3)_6(F, OH)_{2-3}$ and it is the minable deposits. If this apatite-bearing rock is high enough in P content to be used directly to make fertilizer or as a furnace charge to make elemental P, it is called phosphate rock (Cathcart, 1980).

Based on their geological formation, the present phosphate rock mined can be divided into sedimentary, igneous and metamorphic rocks origin (McCleellan and Gremillion, 1980; Slansky, 1986).

